

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 23, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 10, 11, 14 and 18-25 were pending, and rejected claims 1, 10, 11, 14 and 18-25. Thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1, 10, 11, 14 and 18-25 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 10, 11, 14 and 18-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by JUnit. JUnit is a software framework for testing Java programs. This is in contrast to the preset invention wherein a methodology for the automatic generation of tests is claimed. JUnit does not disclose "a test support class generation unit obtaining screen definition information defining a test target screen program that generates and controls a screen, and generating a test support class which is a subclass inheriting a class of the test target screen program responsive to the screen definition information, and a class for testing the test target screen program," of claim 1. At page 12 of JUnit a screen "Search" program is discussed. The program is instantiated from the class SearchPanel. JUnit Page 14, second figure and Page 20, bottom figure. JUnit does not disclose the program SearchPanel (the target class) being inherited by the test screen class. Code snippets for testing show the class being directly instantiated and assigned to a local variable, not being inherited. See page JUnit Page 13, bottom figure and Page 14, first figure.

Further, JUnit does not teach or suggest "a test specification generation unit generating a test specification for the test target screen program according to the definition information, and providing the test specification for the test support class," of claim 1. Page 13, bottom figure shows programmer created code for testing fields of the SearchPanel class. The programmer makes an assertion against the fields of the panel. As the programmer is manually writing these assertions it is not generating a test specification.

Further, as argued above as JUnit does not disclose the automatic generation of a test support class, it therefore does not teach or suggest "a test execution unit conducting a test of the test target screen program defined by the screen definition information using the generated test support class to thereby test the screen program using the graphical user interface," of claim 1.

Further, as JUnit does not disclose the generation of "a test specification", it therefore does not teach or suggest "a test data generation unit supporting input of input test data, by displaying on the screen a menu of a test data and its attribute according to the test

specification, and embedding the test data instructed by an operator in an input field on the screen."

For the reasons stated above, claims 1, 10, 11 and 14 and the claims dependent therefrom are patentable distinguishable from JUnit. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102. It is also submitted that claims 1, 10, 11, 14 and 18-25 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 27, 2006

By: /James J. Livingston/
James J. Livingston
Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501